



# City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning

145 Gorman Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl

Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

[PlanZone@annapolis.gov](mailto:PlanZone@annapolis.gov) • 410-263-7961 • Fax 410-263-1129 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • [www.annapolis.gov](http://www.annapolis.gov)

## Historic Preservation Commission

February 11, 2014

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public meeting on February 11, 2014 in the City Council Chambers. **Vice Chair** Leahy called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

**Commissioners Present:** **Vice Chair** Leahy, Zeno, Kabriel, Toews, Finch, Phillips

**Commissioners Absent:** **Chair** Kennedy

**Staff Present:** Craig-Historic Preservation Officer

**Chair** Kennedy introduced the commissioners and staff. She stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the Land Use Article and administered the oath en mass to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

### C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes up for approval.

### D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

### E. VIOLATIONS

There were no reports of violations.

### F. CONSENT DOCKET

1. **Newman Street Playground** – Marisa Wittlinger/Department of Recreation & Parks/City of Annapolis – Add gate to existing chair link fence. (**Approved as submitted.**)

### G. OLD BUSINESS

1. **11 S. Acton Place** – T. Averill Architect LLC – Construct a 2 ½ story addition with connecting glass bridge topped by a green roof and deck. Landscape includes addition of an in-ground pool, patio and landscaping.

**Ms. Phillips recused herself from hearing and participating on this application.**

**Vice Chair Leahy** went over the protocol for the meeting and enumerated the exhibits presented at the previous meetings.

Mr. Christhilf, Attorney for the Applicant, requested to pick up from the September 10, 2014 meeting where the HPC directive was that the bulk issue had been resolved. He explained that the applicant needs to address the 14 points raised in Ms. Craig's memorandum and the height issue needs to be resolved.

Mr. Averill noted a determination was made that the latest design submittal complied with the height limitations of the historic district. He added that in the revised drawings, there are indications of how the width and height were determined. The November 26, 2013 letter from Mr. Arason marked as Exhibit X

confirms this determination. Mr. Averill met with staff regarding the 14 points and referred to a letter dated October 17, 2013 referred to as Exhibit S. He summarized the contents of the letter indicating that the project is outside of the critical area; the fence permit has been submitted and details provided in the drawings; there is screening for the roof condenser and the screening is high enough to block visibility; cut sheets for the proposed wooden doors have been provided and the elevation for the rear stairs has been corrected; the outdoor shower given a dimension; the 45 degree angle concern from Michael Dowling appeared to be a good fit for the project; the chimney was raised; the curb was removed from the upstairs and straightened out; lowered the ridge by 18"; windows have been inset deeply and molding is a flatten/wider version; rake detail on the Dutch gambrel to 6" to flatten out the new façade; have a sample of the smart glass material that will not reflect light outward; metal roofing will include copper; metal rail will be painted; stucco finish noted on the drawing; all window types designated on the drawings. There were meetings with staff to address concerns regarding the height and width restrictions. There will be a process to address the construction preservation plan concerns and planting plan will be confirmed. He was asked to assess whether the building met ADA requirements and this was summarized in the January 10, 2014 letter. There were further changes to the plan to address concerns regarding the basement floor. The height of the screen wall and the waterside deck was modified. Mr. Averill concluded that the plans are in full compliance with the applicable requirements.

**Staff:** Ms. Craig restated her written staff report of December 18, 2013 and went over some of the items that have been met. She also discussed her amended staff report of January 31, 2014 and recommended approval of the application as amended.

**Public:** Public testimony opened at 8:20pm and those speaking on the application are noted below.

Name	Address	In Favor	In Opposition
Jim Dodson	7 South Acton		X
Daniel Clements	17 Southgate		X
Donna Ware	18 Pinkney		X
Lisa Grasso	5 South Acton		X
Tom Hammond	40 Franklin Street		X

No one else from the public spoke in favor or opposition of the application so **Vice Chair** Leahy declared the public testimony closed at 8:46pm.

The HPC recessed at 8:46pm and reconvened at 8:56pm.

Mr. Christhilf addressed the comments made by the public explaining that the addition is separated from the historic structure. He noted that Ms. Ware indicated the connection element was inappropriate but he believes that it is appropriate referring the HPC to the Courthouse as an example. He noted that comments made by Mr. Dodson either do not apply or will be addressed during the other permitting process. He urged the HPC to adopt the recommendation of the staff to approve this application.

The HPC asked the applicant, staff and its consultants several questions regarding the project. Mr. Menassa explained that the addition is located in the special flood hazard zone and so any new construction must meet the floodplain requirements. The existing structure is outside of the floodplain management area so does not have to meet the floodplain requirements.

**Commissioners:** **Vice Chair** Leahy noted that the HPC deemed this a complete application and the building is contributing so there will be a strict reading of the guidelines applied. He detailed the areas for discussion that include landscape design, archaeology, preservation of historic material, design differentiation and details, ADA, compatibility with the historic district and massing.

### **Landscape Design**

The HPC agreed to the condition that the applicant engage the City arborist on the landscape component of the project. The HPC asked that the applicant provide more detail on the preservation of the critical root zone.

### Archaeology

The application was in compliance with the archaeology component of the project.

### Historic Material

The application complies with guideline D.3.

### Differentiation and Detail

Ms. Zeno found this to be one of the problematic areas not so much as it relates to design differentiation but the number of windows in the connector and if it complies with guideline D.18. The windows will be true divided light and are noted in the details. The application is compliant with guidelines B.2, D.10, D.28b, and D.29.

### ADA

The application is compliant with guideline C.3. Ms. Zeno believes that the applicant did a good job with satisfying the HPC request for an ADA survey. There are no ramps on the primary facade and none of the concessions for ADA compliance harms historic fabric.

### Compatibility

The HPC needs to look at guideline A.3 and B.1 – Does the building compromise the view of Acton Hall? Mr. Toews believes that there is a minimal impact. **Vice Chair** Leahy agreed.

### Massing

The HPC needs to look at guideline B.3. The height issue has been settled. Ms. Zeno raised the issue of guideline D.9 relating to rooftop decks that the guidelines discourage. **Vice Chair** Leahy does not qualify this as a rooftop deck. Ms. Craig believes that this guideline deals with existing historic roof systems versus an addition.

Ms. Zeno commented that this was a very difficult project but believes that the applicant has done a good job of making the changes necessary to move the project forward.

Ms. Zeno noted whereas the application for 11 Acton Place complies with HPC guidelines A.3, B.1, B.2, B.3, B.6, B.8, C.1, C.2, C.3, C.4, C.9, C.11, D.1, D.3, D.10a, D.18, D.20, D.24, D.28b, D.29, D.32, E.1, and E.3, moved approved with the following conditions:

- a) Building permit application be submitted to DNEP;
- b) Product specification sheets for the condenser units be submitted to staff for review;
- c) Construction preservation plan and construction monitoring plan to include archaeology monitoring be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to final issuance of the permit to include traffic handling on the street itself as well as issuance of construction reports;
- d) Relocation of the pool in accordance with the City arborist request;
- e) Consultation with the City arborist during construction process; and
- f) Details of the preservation of the root zone of the champion tree on the property.

Mr. Toews seconded the motion. The motion passed in a vote of 4-1 (Kabriel dissents)

Mr. Christhilf noted that the applicant would like an 18 month extension to commence construction and four years to complete the project. **Vice Chair** Leahy noted that extension requests have been delegated to staff to be approved administratively. Ms. Craig noted that staff does have authority to approve extensions up to one year. The applicant was encouraged to work with staff on the extension request.

The following Commissioners made a site visit on this application.

Name
Leahy, Finch, Zeno, Kabriel, Toews (site visit from public right of way)

**Vice Chair** Leahy accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
JJ	ADA Checklist dated 1/10/14
KK	Snipping Tool

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**1. Final draft of revised Rules of Procedure**

The Rules of Procedure was deferred to the administrative hearing.

With there being no further business, Ms. Zeno moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:06pm. Mr. Kabriel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

**The next meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2014 at 7:30pm at the City Council Chambers.**

Tami Hook, Recorder